

means into those to be performed by the printer and those to be performed by the finishing device."

In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action states that the Hansen patent "teaches a print system wherein the print server directs the jobs to specific production output devices based on attributes of print jobs..." with reference to column 7, lines 30-42 of the patent. In responding to Applicants' arguments traversing the rejection, the Office Action provides the following explanation:

The Hansen patent discloses a print production stage (#108 of fig 1b), performed by the print server, wherein the output resources of the print shop are managed. Management includes queuing of jobs to the to the [sic] proper output devices (col 7, ln 1-42). By selecting an appropriate device to send a job, the operator is implicitly selecting that particular device to perform specific finishing options. Different output devices, #122 of fig 1b, comprise different printing and finishing capabilities. Queuing a print job to a specific printer separates printing and finishing operations to the printer, while other finishing operations may be performed by an "XYZ Off-line Finishing Device" or a "HD Perfect Binder Off-line" to complete the job ticket. It is in this manner that by queuing jobs to different printers with known finishing characteristics, the print server is separating finishing specifics into those performed by the printer and the finisher.

It is respectfully submitted that this disclosure, as explained in the Office Action, does not anticipate, nor otherwise suggest, the *claimed* subject matter. The Hansen patent discloses that different print *jobs* are sent to different respective printers and/or finishing devices, based upon the specific features of the job. Thus, with reference to Figure 1b, a first job may be routed to the Image Runner 110, the next job may go to the XYZ Printer, and a third job may be sent to the Digimaster 9110. However, this functionality is not the same as that recited in the claims.

For example, claim 1 recites that the sorting means performs the function of "separating the finishing specifics *included in the job ticket* received by the receiving means...". In other words, the finishing information *within* a given job ticket received by the receiving means is separated into that which is to be performed by the printer and that which is to be performed by the finishing device. The Hansen patent does not perform this kind of separation. It only discloses that different jobs, as a whole, are routed to different ones of the output devices. It does not disclose that the information for a *given* job, and more particularly the finishing specifics "included in the job ticket", are separated into those to be performed by two different devices. It only treats the job as a unit and does not disclose the separation of information pertaining to a particular job into different components.

The Office Action appears to overlook this claimed feature. For instance, the above-quoted passage refers to "queuing jobs to different printers...". It does not address the specific language of the claim, e.g. "separating the finishing specifics *included in the job ticket* received by the receiving means into those to be performed by the printer and those to be performed by the finishing device ". There is no explanation how the Hansen patent can be interpreted to disclose separation of information at this level.


Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the "sorting" function that is performed in the Hansen patent, namely routing different jobs to different output devices, is not the same as the separating function that is recited in the rejected claims. For at least this reason, therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Hansen patent does not anticipate the claims, nor otherwise render them obvious.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections based upon the Hansen patent, and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

Date: April 10, 2006

By: 
James A. LaBarre
Registration No. 28,632

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620